



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/580,378	05/22/2006	Juha Iso-Sipila	857.0052.U1(US)	2561
29683	7590	03/17/2009	EXAMINER	
HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC 4 RESEARCH DRIVE, Suite 202 SHELTON, CT 06484-6212			COLUCCI, MICHAEL C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2626	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/580,378	Applicant(s) ISO-SIPILA ET AL.	
	Examiner MICHAEL C. COLUCCI	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-37 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-37 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicants arguments with respect to claims 19-37 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. Examiner has withdrawn King US 6532446 B1 (hereinafter King) in view of Van Gestel US 6963836 B2 (hereinafter Van Gestel) and has incorporated Martino et al. US 6061646 A (hereinafter Martino) and Kitahara et al. US 7130801 B2 (hereinafter Kitahara).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 19-21, 23, 26, 29, 30, 32, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Martino et al. US 6061646 A (hereinafter Martino).

Re claims 19, 26, and 32, Martino teaches an electronic device, comprising: at least one user interface, said at least one user interface comprising a speech recognition system; and a memory that stores a data structure that comprises a plurality of language packages, each of said plurality of language packages having associated therewith with a plurality of languages, where at least some of said plurality of languages are associated with more than one of said plurality of language packages, where one of said plurality of language packages is arranged to be selected for use by

Art Unit: 2626

said speech recognition system when recognizing a user's speech; said device being arranged to register at least a first language for said at least one user interface and, on the basis of at least the registered first language, to automatically perform a selection from said data structure of one of said plurality of language packages for use by said speech recognition system (Col. 9 line 54 – Col. 10 line 17 & Fig. 3).

Re claim 20, Martino teaches the device according to claim 19, where if the registered first language is associated with more than one of said plurality of language packages, said device is arranged to register in addition a second language and, on the basis of the first and second registered languages, to automatically select one of said plurality of language packages (Col. 9 line 54 – Col. 10 line 17 & Fig. 3).

Re claims 21 and 29, Martino teaches the device according to claim 19, where a native language package is set for each language (Col. 8 lines 30-42).

Re claims 23, 30, and 35, Martino teaches the device according to claim 19, where said data structure is arranged to form a look-up table from which selection of the language package is automatically performed (Fig. 3 elements 181 and 183, retrieves the language and thus the language group/package).

Art Unit: 2626

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 31, 33, 34, 36, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martino et al. US 6061646 A (hereinafter Martino) in view of Kitahara et al. US 7130801 B2 (hereinafter Kitahara).

Re claim 22, Martino teaches the device according to claim 20, where the first language is a selected device control user interface language (Col. 8 lines 30-42), and where the second language is a selected graphical user interface language.

However, Martino fails to teach a second language is a selected graphical user interface language

Kitahara teaches that a user transmits speech by telephone to an automatic interpretation server, and the speech is returned in a translated form to the user's telephone. When the user first establishes connection from a telephone, preferably a telephone on which mobile Internet access service is available, to a mobile Internet access service gateway server via a mobile Internet access service packet network, the automatic interpretation server allows the user to display a menu of interpretable language on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to select from the language classification menu the language into which the translation is

Art Unit: 2626

to be performed. Also, the server preferably allows the user to display an interpretable model sentence scene on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to select from the scene menu an interpretable sentence scene-of-use.

Further, the server allows the user to display a model sentence that can be inputted on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to input, in audio, that model sentence while watching the model sentence on the screen (Kitahara Col. 2 line 54 – Col. 2 line 11 & Fig. 10 display language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Martino to incorporate a second language is a selected graphical user interface language as taught by Kitahara to allow for two distinct languages, wherein a user can speak a language and output a different language than what is spoken in order to interpret various multilingual information graphically (Kitahara Col. 2 line 54 – Col. 2 line 11 & Fig. 10 display language).

Re claims 24, 31, and 36, Martino teaches the device according to claim 23, where voice user interface language and user interface language combinations are arranged in the look-up table, where one of the plurality of language packages that is suitable for selection for each voice user interface language and user interface language combination is linked (Fig. 3 elements 181 and 183, retrieves the language and thus the language group/package, wherein the language selected is directly linked to various dictionaries).

However, Martino fails to teach a second language is a selected user interface language combinations

Kitahara teaches that a user transmits speech by telephone to an automatic interpretation server, and the speech is returned in a translated form to the user's telephone. When the user first establishes connection from a telephone, preferably a telephone on which mobile Internet access service is available, to a mobile Internet access service gateway server via a mobile Internet access service packet network, the automatic interpretation server allows the user to display a menu of interpretable language on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to select from the language classification menu the language into which the translation is to be performed. Also, the server preferably allows the user to display an interpretable model sentence scene on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to select from the scene menu an interpretable sentence scene-of-use. Further, the server allows the user to display a model sentence that can be inputted on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to input, in audio, that model sentence while watching the model sentence on the screen (Kitahara Col. 2 line 54 – Col. 2 line 11 & Fig. 10 display language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Martino to incorporate a second language is a selected user interface language combinations as taught by Kitahara to allow for two distinct languages, wherein a user can speak a language and output a different

Art Unit: 2626

language than what is spoken in order to interpret various multilingual information graphically (Kitahara Col. 2 line 54 – Col. 2 line 11 & Fig. 10 display language).

Re claims 25 and 37, Martino fails to teach the device according to claim 19, where said device is embodied as a mobile station.

Kitahara teaches that a user transmits speech by telephone to an automatic interpretation server, and the speech is returned in a translated form to the user's telephone. When the user first establishes connection from a telephone, preferably a telephone on which mobile Internet access service is available, to a mobile Internet access service gateway server via a mobile Internet access service packet network, the automatic interpretation server allows the user to display a menu of interpretable language on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to select from the language classification menu the language into which the translation is to be performed. Also, the server preferably allows the user to display an interpretable model sentence scene on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to select from the scene menu an interpretable sentence scene-of-use. Further, the server allows the user to display a model sentence that can be inputted on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to input, in audio, that model sentence while watching the model sentence on the screen (Kitahara Col. 2 line 54 – Col. 2 line 11 & Fig. 10 display language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Martino to incorporate a mobile station as taught by Kitahara to allow for portable operation using two distinct languages, wherein a user can speak a language and output a different language than what is spoken in order to interpret various multilingual information graphically (Kitahara Col. 2 line 54 – Col. 2 line 11 & Fig. 10 display language).

Re claims 27 and 33, Martino teaches the method of claim 26, where there are a plurality of user interfaces comprising at least a device control user interface and a graphical user interface (Col. 9 line 54 – Col. 10 line 17 & Fig. 3), further comprising a user selecting a language for each of the plurality of user interfaces, and where automatically selecting selects one appropriate language package from the data structure in accordance with the user- selected languages.

However, Martino fails to teach a user selecting a language for each of the plurality of user interfaces

Kitahara teaches that a user transmits speech by telephone to an automatic interpretation server, and the speech is returned in a translated form to the user's telephone. When the user first establishes connection from a telephone, preferably a telephone on which mobile Internet access service is available, to a mobile Internet access service gateway server via a mobile Internet access service packet network, the automatic interpretation server allows the user to display a menu of interpretable language on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to

Art Unit: 2626

select from the language classification menu the language into which the translation is to be performed. Also, the server preferably allows the user to display an interpretable model sentence scene on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to select from the scene menu an interpretable sentence scene-of-use.

Further, the server allows the user to display a model sentence that can be inputted on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to input, in audio, that model sentence while watching the model sentence on the screen (Kitahara Col. 2 line 54 – Col. 2 line 11 & Fig. 10 display language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Martino to incorporate a user selecting a language for each of the plurality of user interfaces as taught by Kitahara to allow for two distinct languages, wherein a user can speak a language and output a different language than what is spoken in order to interpret various multilingual information graphically, where a user can communicate remotely to control various remote apparatuses during communication (Kitahara Col. 2 line 54 – Col. 2 line 11 & Fig. 10 display language).

Re claims 28 and 34, Martino teaches the method according to claim 26, where a first language is selected for a first user interface and if the selected first language is associated with a single language package, the single language package is automatically selected on the basis of the selected first registered language; and where if the selected first language is associated with more than one language package (Col. 9

Art Unit: 2626

line 54 – Col. 10 line 17 & Fig. 3), further comprising selecting a second language for a second user interface, and where the one language package is automatically selected on the basis of the selected first and second languages.

However, Martino fails to teach selecting a second language for a second user interface, and where the one language package is automatically selected on the basis of the selected first and second languages

Kitahara teaches that a user transmits speech by telephone to an automatic interpretation server, and the speech is returned in a translated form to the user's telephone. When the user first establishes connection from a telephone, preferably a telephone on which mobile Internet access service is available, to a mobile Internet access service gateway server via a mobile Internet access service packet network, the automatic interpretation server allows the user to display a menu of interpretable language on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to select from the language classification menu the language into which the translation is to be performed. Also, the server preferably allows the user to display an interpretable model sentence scene on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to select from the scene menu an interpretable sentence scene-of-use. Further, the server allows the user to display a model sentence that can be inputted on the display screen of the user's telephone, to thereby enable the user to input, in audio, that model sentence while watching the model sentence on the screen (Kitahara Col. 2 line 54 – Col. 2 line 11 & Fig. 10 display language).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the system of Martino to incorporate selecting a second language for a second user interface, and where the one language package is automatically selected on the basis of the selected first and second languages as taught by Kitahara to allow for two distinct languages, wherein a user can speak a language and output a different language than what is spoken in order to interpret various multilingual information graphically, where a user can communicate remotely to control various remote apparatuses during communication (Kitahara Col. 2 line 54 – Col. 2 line 11 & Fig. 10 display language).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Colucci whose telephone number is (571)-270-1847. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30 am - 6:00 pm, Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on (571)-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael C Colucci/
Examiner, Art Unit 2626
Patent Examiner
AU 2626
(571)-270-1847
Michael.Colucci@uspto.gov

/Richemond Dorvil/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2626